


[HHSDC Home](#)
[BP Home Page](#)
[The MSC](#)
[CMM](#)
[POST Enterprise](#)
[The Project Office](#)
[Life Cycle Processes](#)
[Search BP](#)
[HHSDC Links](#)
[Resources Library](#)
[QAWG NEW!](#)
[SID Policy NEW!](#)
[Contact Us](#)


☒ My CA

Contract Management - Reviewing Deliverables

[Contract Main](#)

When the contractor submits a deliverable for approval, the item must be logged, reviewed and any comments tracked to resolution. When the approval is finally received, the project should send a letter of acceptance to the contractor. All versions of deliverables should be kept for historical purposes along with documented comments and agreements regarding those comments.

A documented Deliverable Review and Management process is recommended to ensure all parties understand their role. The process must ensure that the deliverable is reviewed in a timely manner and examined to determine if the deliverable met all its contractual requirements. In many cases, a **Deliverable Expectation Document (DED) or Data Item Description (DID)** is used to clarify the expectations of the deliverable prior to submission. The process should address who is ultimately responsible for accepting the deliverable, what criteria will be used for evaluation, what deliverable acceptance means, and what to do in the event the deliverable does not meet the contractual expectations.

In some cases, interim or informal reviews of sections or whole deliverables may be appropriate to establish correct level of detail and organization of materials.

The general steps for deliverable review are as follows.

1. Log the deliverable into the tracking system. Note the date of receipt and make copies for the library. Store the electronic version in the document management system. (Deliverable Monitor or Clerical)
2. Route the deliverable to the appropriate list of reviewers based on the DED or other predetermined criteria. Note the review due date, to whom comments should be returned and if there are dependencies on other deliverables. Indicate the associated DED/DID, industry and government standards, applicable contract clauses, and expectations from the SOW that should be used to review the document, as applicable.
3. If federal review/approval is required, submit the deliverable to the appropriate federal contact(s). Note in the tracking system the transmittal/submission date, whom the deliverable was sent to (including CCs/BCCs), when a response was received, and any comments. (Deliverable Monitor)
4. Review the deliverable for correctness, completeness and appropriate level of detail. Use the **general deliverable review criteria** to help determine if the deliverable meets expectations. Submit comments on the deliverable to the Functional Manager or Lead Reviewer. (Reviewers)
5. When the comments have been received, the Functional Manager (or designated Lead Reviewer) reviews the comments and determines if there are any critical comments that must be addressed prior to deliverable acceptance. (Functional Manager or Lead Reviewer)
6. If comments must be addressed, review the contract, HHSDC's processes, and the State guidelines for the deliverable dispute process. If the deliverable is unacceptable and there are associated damages, consult the Project Manager, Legal, and DGS to determine how to proceed.

Prepare a letter to the contractor indicating the comments, rationale for disapproval, consequences of disapproval (e.g., delayed start of next phase, etc.) and next steps. Only the Project Manager (or formally designated State official) may sign the dispute/comments letter. A copy should be saved to the contract file. Remind the contractor that any associated invoice will not be paid until the deliverable is approved. (Functional Manager or Lead Reviewer)

7. Throughout the review process, track the status of the review in the tracking system. Note the date the review was started, the review due date, and when the item was approved or disputed. Any minor issues may be recorded and tracked to completion in the Issue Tracking System. (Deliverable Monitor)

Collect and track review and deliverable metrics. Discuss any negative trends or concerns with the Project Manager and the contractor. (Deliverable Monitor)

If appropriate, modify the review and submission process to remove bottlenecks or breakdowns, or instruct the contractor to submit a **Corrective Action Plan (CAP)** (MS Word) or revised process description to address the problem. (Functional or Contract Manager)

8. When a revised deliverable is submitted, repeat steps 1-6 but do not remove or alter information related to the first deliverable.
9. When the deliverable is ready for approval, prepare a letter of deliverable acceptance. If the acceptance is part of a milestone criteria or other pending action, explicitly state how the deliverable acceptance affects the pending action/decision (e.g., does the acceptance close the phase/milestone?). Obtain a State Manager's signature (usually the Contract Manager or Project Manager) on the letter. Make a copy for the contract file and submit the letter to the contractor. (Deliverable Monitor)

Metrics and Tracking Data

The following are some suggested metrics to assist with tracking. Metrics should be collected for all deliverables, and then accumulated to show trends by date period (month, quarter, year), project phase (requirements, design, etc.), and, in some cases, by project area (case management, out-of-state interfaces, etc.), contractor or type of deliverable.

- Number of days to process a deliverable
- Number of deliverables received on-time
- Number of deliverables received late
- Number of deliverables approved
- Number of deliverables disputed/disapproved
- Number of comments per deliverable (may also sort by type or category of deliverable)
- Number of deliverables submitted for Federal review/approval

Samples and Supporting Materials

- [CCSA Deliverable Management Process](#) (pdf)
- [CalWIN Deliverable Development, Review and Approval Process](#) (pdf)
- [CalWIN Deliverable Submission Process](#) (pdf)
- [C-IV Deliverable Development, Production and Review Procedures](#) (pdf)
- [DCSS IV&V Deliverable Management Process](#) (MS Word)
- [EBT Deliverable Management Process](#) (MS Word)
- [EBT Deliverable Review Comment Form](#) (MS Word)
- [SAWS Deliverable Review Process](#) (pdf)
- [SAWS Deliverable Review Strategy](#) (pdf)
- SFIS Deliverable Document Evaluation (DDE) Form (MS Word)
 - SFIS Sample DDE for an Ops Plan (MS Word)
 - SFIS Sample DDE for an Acceptable Format for Recovery Plan (MS Word)
 - SFIS Sample DDE for a Conditional Acceptance of Recovery Plan (MS Word)

California Home

Wednesday, November 19, 2003

[HHSDC Home](#)[BP Home Page](#)[The MSC](#)[CMM](#)[POST Enterprise](#)[The Project Office](#)[Life Cycle Processes](#)[Search BP](#)[HHSDC Links](#)[Resources Library](#)[QAWG](#) **NEW!**[SID Policy](#) **NEW!**[Contact Us](#)

☒ My CA

Contract Management - Deliverable Expectation Documents

[Contract Main](#)

Description:

The Deliverable Expectation Document (DED) is used to ensure that the deliverable submitted by the contractor meets the expectations of the project. The DED is sometimes treated as a deliverable itself, that is created and reviewed prior to beginning the actual deliverable document. The project should confirm the review team and time, and ensure the acceptance criteria from the RFP and SOW are clarified or referenced. The DED typically discusses:

- Format of the Deliverable, including length/size, number of copies, media/electronic version
- Table of Contents or Outline of Proposed Contents
- Level of Detail
- Key Evaluation Criteria and Applicable Industry or Government Standards
- Acceptance Criteria
 - For instance, if certain procedures or diagrams must be approved by a stakeholder
 - In cases where the contractor's methodologies differ from the State's methods, the contractor may be required to map or compare their methods to the State's
 - An updated Requirements Traceability Matrix should be mandatory for most deliverables
- Anticipated Delivery Date
- Expected Review Team (based on skills or position), including Sponsor, Stakeholder and User representatives where appropriate
- Expected Amount of Time for Review

Another option is to use a Data Item Description (DID). A DID is typically included or referenced in the RFP and provides the same type of expectations as a DED. The difference is that a DID contains a standard, non-tailored description of a deliverable and is provided by the project to the contractor. A DED is created by the contractor and delivered to the project for approval; it is created specifically for the project.

Sample Processes:

- [DCSS IV&V Sample Contractual Language to explain DEDs](#)
- [CalWIN Deliverable Expectation Process](#) (pdf)
- [CalWIN Deliverable Expectation Document Template](#) (pdf)
- [LEADER Consortium Deliverable Standards Manual](#) (pdf)
- SFIS Deliverable Document Evaluation (DDE) Form (MS Word)
 - SFIS Sample DDE for an Ops Plan (MS Word)
 - SFIS Sample DDE for an Acceptable Format for Recovery Plan (MS Word)
 - SFIS Sample DDE for a Conditional Acceptance of Recovery Plan (MS Word)

Sample DEDs:

- [DCSS IV&V Oversight Monthly Planning Oversight Report DED](#) (pdf)
- [EBT County Cash Access Plan DED](#) (MS Word)
- [EBT Requirements Traceability Plan and Matrix DED](#) (MS Word)
- [WDTIP Communication Plan DED](#) (pdf)
- [WDTIP Configuration Management Plan DED](#) (pdf)

- [WDTIP Implementation Plan DED](#) (pdf)
- [WDTIP Project Management Plan DED](#) (pdf)

Sample DIDs from MIL-STD-498 (in pdf):

- [Computer Operations Manual DID](#)
- [Computer Programming Manual DID](#)
- [Database Design Description \(DBDD\) DID](#)
- [Interface Design Document \(IDD\) DID](#)
- [Interface Requirements Specification \(IRS\) DID](#)
- [Operational Concept Description \(ConOps\) DID](#)
- [Software Center Operations Manual DID](#)
- [Software Design Description \(SDD\) DID](#)
- [Software Development Plan \(SDP\) DID](#)
- [Software Input-Output Manual DID](#)
- [Software Installation Plan DID](#)
- [Software Product Specification DID](#)
- [Software Requirements Specification \(SRS\) DID](#)
- [Software Test Description DID](#)
- [Software Test Plan DID](#)
- [Software Test Report DID](#)
- [Software Transition Plan DID](#)
- [Software User Manual DID](#)
- [Software Version Description \(SVD/VDD\) DID](#)
- [System/Subsystem Design Description DID](#)
- [System/Subsystem Specification DID](#)

California Home

Wednesday, November 19, 2003

[HHSDC Home](#)[BP Home Page](#)[The MSC](#)[CMM](#)[POST Enterprise](#)[The Project Office](#)[Life Cycle Processes](#)[Search BP](#)[HHSDC Links](#)[Resources Library](#)[QAWG](#) **NEW!**[SID Policy](#) **NEW!**[Contact Us](#)

search

☒ My CA

Contract Management - DED Language for SOW

[Contract Main](#)

The following sample language is used in the Statement of Work to describe the requirement for using DEDs.

a. Deliverable Expectation Document

The contractor will provide HHSDC with a "Deliverable Expectations Document (DED)" for each deliverable prior to expending substantial resources on the subject deliverable. The use of standards are required when appropriate and should be defined and justified. The DED will identify and describe:

- The scope and contents of the deliverable;
- The methods and tools to be used to conduct the review; and
- The criteria and standards to be applied.

DED's must be approved in writing by HHSDC, however, DED's are not considered "payment deliverables."

Deliverables must be approved for payment by HHSDC prior to payment of monthly withhold amounts. HHSDC approval will be based upon the following criteria:

- Conformance with the approved DED;
- Finding and conclusions supported by sufficient, competent, and relevant evidence.

California Home

Wednesday, November 19, 2003

[HHSDC Home](#)[BP Home Page](#)[The MSC](#)[CMM](#)[POST Enterprise](#)[The Project Office](#)[Life Cycle Processes](#)[Search BP](#)[HHSDC Links](#)[Resources Library](#)[QAWG](#) **NEW!**[SID Policy](#) **NEW!**[Contact Us](#)

search

☒ My CA

Contract Management - General Deliverable Review Criteria

[Contract Main](#)

Regardless of the type of the deliverable, these general criteria should be considered.

Content Criteria

1. Is the deliverable clearly written or presented?
2. Is the deliverable at the appropriate and agreed upon level of detail?
3. Is the deliverable written or presented for the appropriate audience? Is there an assumed level of expertise or knowledge needed to use/understand the deliverable? Is this assumption clearly explained and justified? Is this assumption appropriate for this deliverable?
4. Does the deliverable meet the criteria and expectations from the DED/DID, SOW and/or contract? Have all mandatory items/sections been adequately addressed?
5. Does the deliverable meet the cited/applicable industry and government standards?
6. If the deliverable is dependent or related to another deliverable, is it clear why there is a dependency? Is the dependency appropriate?
7. Does the deliverable contribute towards the maintenance of the system? Is there sufficient information to assist the maintenance and operations staff?
8. Is the deliverable maintainable in its present form by the maintenance and operations staff?
9. Has the requirements traceability matrix/tool been updated to indicate where this document satisfies or traces to the requirements (both system and contractual)?
10. Does the deliverable meet the acceptance criteria from the DED/DID, SOW, contract, etc.?
11. Does the deliverable meet the expectations for its intended use?

Administrative Criteria

1. Was it delivered on time? If not, did the Project Manager grant a waiver for the late delivery PRIOR to the deliverable submission?
2. Does the deliverable meet the expectations for size/length?
3. Were the expected number of copies delivered?
4. Was the deliverable submitted in the agreed upon format, media and version?
5. Does the deliverable clearly identify the deliverable requirement and/or contract requirement that it is associated with? (Either by title, document or deliverable number, WBS number, or contract clause number)

6. Were there performance metrics collected for this deliverable review? If so, do the metrics indicate any negative trends or concerns? Are there reasonable explanations for the trends or problems (such as large numbers of sick staff, known equipment failures, large number of recently incorporated scope changes, etc.)?